



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_36252
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Helicobacter pylori infection on selected biochemical parameters of hypertensive patients at Dschang District Hospital in Cameroon
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Comments 1. The authors used " Helicobacter pylori infection" in the whole text but they only investigated the presence of H. pylori IgG. Therefore, they used "Helicobacter pylori IgG seropositivity" instead of "Helicobacter pylori infection". They can only use this term" Helicobacter pylori infection" in cases which H. pylori DNA were investigated. They should revise it to "Helicobacter pylori IgG seropositivity" for entire text. 2. They gave mean avera age of total group, but they should indicate each groups' average ages, and gender individually. They also add a sentence that the groups were matched for age. The number of patients in HP+ group, this may affected the results and this comparison should be confirmed by a statistician. If this decreased patient number is an handicap, it should be indicasted as a limitation in the Discussion part. 3. They used HT+, HP and HT HP+ as study groups and HT-HP- as the control group. In Page 6, lines 114-119, patient groups were compared with the control group. After evaluation of tables, it is clear that investigated biochemical parameters in the patients groups were similiar (Table 2). On the other hand many parameters are lower in only HP+ group. They should also discuss the probability of conversion to normol blood pressure after H. pylori eradication treatment in the discussion section.	1. Answer: Thank you for your suggestions. Corrections have been done as per your suggestions. 2. Answer: Corrections have been done as per your suggestions. 3. Answer: In this study, patients are not under treatment for high blood pressure. They were recruited as soon as they were admitted to the hospital. 4. Answer: It is important to know that average rates of biochemical parameters could hide some existing abnormalities. Reason why in table 2, the proportions of abnormal values of participants are given for each biochemical parameter. 5. Answer: Corrections have been done and "suggesting" instead of "confirming" was used in the sentence. 6. Answer: Corrections have been done as per your suggestions. 7. Answer: Corrections have been done as per



SDI Review Form 1.6

	4. I did not understand the necessity of Table 2, they may add the 1p1 values to the table 1. 5. The authors indicated “Abnormal high prevalences of LDL cholesterol, total cholesterol and HDL cholesterol were observed in the groups HT+, HT+HP+ and HP+ as compared to the group HT-HP-. These parameters are influenced by both hypertension and H. pylori infection confirming a significant association between H. pylori and hypertension as well as the effects of H. pylori infection on hypertension and LDL cholesterol.”. How can they say there is a relationship between H. pylori infection and hypertension? Because, the biochemical parameters are almost the similar in HT+ and HT+HP+ groups. The changes or increase in these parameters may be due to the effects of hypertension alone. Therefore they should use suggesting instead of confirming in this sentence. 6. Also, in lines, 182-182, they should use” H. pylori may play a role in inducing” instead of“H. pylori plays a role in inducing”, 7. The authors should increase the number of regional references, for example, H. pylori seroprevalance in their region and they should revise old references to recent references. 8. They should avoid to make certain conclusions, especially at the last paragraph of the discussion. They may use " suggest" in their conclusion statements. 9. The correlations between some studied biochemical parameters have been established (Table 3). It was observed in general that a strong correlation exist between these biochemical parameters.” What does it mean; they	your suggestions. 8. Answer: Corrections have been done as per your suggestions. 9. Answer: Corrections were made in addition to the elements of discussion with respect to this aspect already present in the article. 10. Answer: Corrections have been done as per your suggestions.
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	should discuss the importance of it. What are the consequences of these correlations?. 10. Discussion;” The high prevalence of 46.75% of H. pylori infection amongst hypertensive patients shows that this infection is a risk factor for hypertension.”, they should use “may show instead of “shows”.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		